<u>REMARKS</u>

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action dated August 15, 2003, which has a shortened statutory period set to expire November 15, 2003. A Petition for a one month extension of time extending the period of response to December 15, 2003 is included with this response.

Applicants have amended Figure 1. Specifically, voice portal 110 now includes a state management access policy that includes cookies. Support for this amendment is found in the Specification, page 28, lines 18-22. Therefore, no new matter is added. Applicants have also amended the Specification to include reference to step 406 of Figure 4. This step was clearly implied by the existing text in the Specification. Therefore, the amendment to the Specification, page 24, lines 13-15 is not new matter. Based on the changes to Figure 1 and the description of Figure 4, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

Applicants have amended the Specification to delete embedded hyperlinks, as required by MPEP Section 608.01. Based on these changes, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the Specification.

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection to text provided in the Specification, i.e. the terms state, application, and legal entity. These terms, erroneously characterized as "unclear, inexact, or verbose" in the Office Action, are well-known terms that accurately describe aspects and features of Applicants' invention.

The term "state" refers to the last-known or current status of an application. Because the Internet is intrinsically stateless, i.e. each request for a new web page is processed without knowledge of previously requested pages, maintaining state is difficult. Hence, the advantage of sending cookies to

facilitate accessing an application. IETF RFC 2109 frequently uses the term "state" (e.g. the proxy server has state information about its relationship with the client that it wants the client to remember and to return with each request, page 1, 2. Introduction).

The term "application" refers to a program or a group of programs designed for end users. Applications differ from system software, which includes low-level programs that interact with the computer at a very basic level. The Specification, page 7, lines 3-7, teaches a voice portal supporting electronic commerce over a telephone interface. This voice portal allows users to dial a phone number to purchase goods and services and interact with applications. The information provided over the voice portal may come from the World Wide Web, databases, third parties, and/or other sources. This term is used consistently in the Specification.

The term "legal entity" refers to an individual or organization. For example, the Specification, page 7, lines 21-23, teaches that applications provided by multiple legal entities can provide services to users via phone applications hosted on, or through, the voice portal while allowing state information to be stored on a per-user profile basis. This term is also used consistently in the Specification.

Based on the above remarks, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the Specification.

Applicants assume that the objection to Claims 1, 2, and 11-13 are related to the objections made with respect to the Specification. Therefore, based on the above remarks, Applicants also request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to Claims 1, 2, and 11-13.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1, 11, and 15 based on selecting a state. As taught in the Specification, page 7, lines 21-23, embodiments of the invention allow applications provided by multiple legal entities to provide services to users via phone applications hosted on, or through, the voice portal while allowing state information to be stored on a per-user profile basis. Because the voice portal stores state information associated with each user, clearly the state information must be selected. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 11, and 15.

Claim 14 is amended to delete references to SSL and HTTPS. Moreover, claim 14 is amended to recite "a telephone". Therefore, based on these amendments, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 14.

Claims 1-19 Are Patentable Over The Cited References

Claim 1, as amended, now recites in part:

> based on a policy for the voice portal, automatically providing a subset of the plurality of cookies to the application using the first computer …
> wherein the policy is dependent on needs of the application on the voice portal, first decisions made by at least one operator of the voice portal, and second decisions made by users of the voice portal.

Claim 11, as amended, now recites in part:

> means for automatically providing a subset of the plurality of cookies to an application based on a policy for the voice portal, wherein the providing is responsive to receiving a request over the telephone interface to initiate an application, and wherein the policy is dependent on needs of the application on the voice portal, first decisions made by at least

one operator of the voice portal, and second decisions made by users of the voice portal.

Claim 14, as amended, now recites in part:

based on a policy for the control subsystem automatically providing a subset of the plurality of cookies over the Internet interface when retrieving the application, wherein the policy is dependent on needs of the application on the control subsystem, first decisions made by at least one operator of the control subsystem, and second decisions made by users of the control subsystem.

Claim 15, as amended, now recites in part:

a fourth set of instructions for automatically providing a subset of the plurality of cookies to an application based on a policy for the voice portal, wherein the providing is responsive to receiving a request over the telephone interface to initiate an application, and wherein the policy is dependent on needs of the application on the voice portal, first decisions made by at least one operator of the voice portal, and second decisions made by users of the voice portal.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither IETF RFC 2109 nor Bennett teach these features.

Specifically, IETF RFC 2109 teaches a system in which a proxy server has state information about its relationship with the client that it wants the client to remember and to return with each request. Exemplary state information can include identity or preference information. Page 1, 2. Introduction. IEFT FRC 2109 further teaches that a CommentURL attribute allows a proxy server to document how it intends to user a PCookie (i.e. state information). The user can inspect the information identified by the URL to decide whether to initiate or continue a session with this PCookie. Page 4, 5.2 Proxy Server Role.

Therefore, because IETF RFC 2109 teaches an end-to-end mechanism, IETF fails to disclose or suggest at least the recited voice portal (Claims 1, 11, and 15) and the recited control subsystem.

Bennett teaches a system in which data files containing information tokens can be stored with an AIN rather than at a caller CPE (customer premises equipment). Col. 6, line 60 to Col. 7, line 16. A caller can initiate a call to a called party CPE from a caller CPE. The call is routed by a SSP to a remote switch via a PSTN. The called party CPE receives the incoming call over one line. During call setup, caller identification information can be transferred from the SSP to the called party CPE. The caller information can include a 10-digit phone number identifying the caller CPE 12. During the ensuing conversation between the caller CPE and the called party CPE, the called party CPE can place a second call over another line to access a cookie file stored within the AIN. The second call is routed by the switch to the SSP via the PSTN. The SSP then connects the call to an SN/IP. During this second call, the caller information about the caller CPE is provided to the SN/IP, which in turn sends a message to the SCP requesting the retrieval of a cookie file corresponding to the caller information and any other parameters included by the called CPE. Therefore, Bennett fails to disclose or suggest the recited policy for the voice portal, which is determined based on input from the operator, the user, and the application site.

Therefore, based on the above remarks, Applicants requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 11, 14, and 15.

Claims 2-10 depend from Claim 1, Claims 12-13 depend from Claim 11, and Claims 16-19 depend from Claim 15. Based on these

dependencies, Applicants also request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 2-10, 12-13, and 16-19.

Applicants note that Krane fails to remedy the deficiencies of IETF RFC 2109 and Bennett. Specifically, Krane teaches a communication system for providing telephone access to pre-recorded audio messages via the Internet. Col. 2, lines 24-26. However, of importance, Krane teaches nothing regarding the recited voice portal or recited control subsystem.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-19 are pending in the present Application. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any questions, please telephone the undersigned at 408-451-5907 to expedite prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Customer No.: 24488

Jeanette S. Harms
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 35,537

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as FIRST CLASS MAIL in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on November 21, 2003.

11/21/03
Date

Signature

17

(SN: 09/592,321)